



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE PENTATEUCHAL QUESTION. II. GEN. 12:6-37:1.

BY PROFESSOR W. HENRY GREEN,

Princeton Theological Seminary.

PRELIMINARY REMARKS.

In resuming the discussion of the divisive hypothesis in its application to the Book of Genesis, a brief statement may be made at the outset of the attitude taken and the positions which it is believed can be successfully established.

1. The hypothesis that the Pentateuch as a whole or Genesis in particular is made up of documents originally distinct, but which have been woven together in their present form by a Redactor, has no external support whatever. There is no intimation in any quarter that such documents ever existed, or that a composite origin was ever attributed to the Pentateuch or to any part of it. The burden of proof lies wholly upon those who affirm the existence of these documents; and the proof demanded should be clear and convincing in proportion to the revolutionary character of the hypothesis and the gravity of the consequences deduced from it.

2. The criteria relied upon to establish the hypothesis are precarious to the last degree. The chances of error in effecting the analysis multiply with every step of the process, while there is no possibility of verifying the results. Under these circumstances one may be pardoned for hesitating to accept conclusions, however confidently put forth, respecting the precise share of several different writers otherwise unknown, in what is assumed to have been their joint production.

3. The harmony and continuity of the history and the clear evidences of a plan consistently pursued throughout, which has shaped the whole from first to last, and into which every separate portion enters as a component part, positively exclude the idea that Genesis is made up of selections from independent documents separately conceived and written.

In entering upon the examination of a new section of Genesis we are entitled to assume the results previously reached in the portion already traversed. Every argument adduced by critics for the first eleven chapters has been carefully, and, I think it may be said, candidly examined, and found to be inconclusive. And as the early chapters of Genesis have always been regarded as the stronghold of the hypothesis, the part to which it can with most plausibility be applied, and where, if anywhere, its truth can be established, our experience has only tended to increase our distrust of both the methods and the results, which have thus far been

found to be arbitrary and fallacious. At the very least it may be claimed, that so far as we have been able to discover, no presumption arises in favor of the critical partition of Genesis from chs. 1-11. Is there any more reason for accepting the partition in the chapters that follow? This is the question to which we now address ourselves.

The Divine Names.

The alternate use of the divine names Elohim and Jehovah in successive sections of Genesis first suggested the critical partition of the book upon this basis. The radical assumption has been that different writers respectively characterized by the employment of one or other of these terms for God, could alone account for the phenomena. Other considerations have been held to corroborate this, such as the alleged continuity of P and J sections respectively, and certain characteristics of style and thought, which it is claimed, are peculiar to each. Nevertheless the alternation of the divine names remains the corner-stone of the critical edifice in all its forms. In the recent refinements of the hypothesis and attempts to render the analysis more subtle and searching, increased stress has been laid on the collateral supports, and many discriminations are made, which rest on them alone. But the divine names are, after all, the starting point of the hypothesis and that upon which it ultimately reposes. It is upon this basis and within the limits of sections thus determined, that the first steps have to be taken toward gathering other criteria of P or J, and whatever plausibility these possess, is due to the alleged fact that they are peculiar to sections characterized by one particular name. The divine names are thus cardinal and fundamental to the hypothesis, while all beside is secondary and subsidiary.

It is accordingly of prime importance in this discussion to ascertain whether the manner, in which the divine names are employed in Genesis, lends any real support to the hypothesis. We have already seen that in Genesis, chs. 1-11, they are used appropriately and significantly, and in a manner to indicate intelligent use by a writer, alive to their distinctive meaning, rather than the accidental result of blending two distinct writings. The same is the case in the section of Genesis now before us, chs. 12-36; the divine names there found do not justify critical partition, for

1. In several instances the name Jehovah occurs where it cannot be made to conform to the hypothesis, and the critics are obliged to rid themselves of it by arbitrarily changing the text, or calling in the aid of the Redactor. This is the more remarkable because it is a ruling principle with the critics to adjust their sections into harmony with the divine names, so that the occurrence of Elohim or of Jehovah *ipso facto* determines the document to which any given passage must be assigned. And yet, in the cases referred to, "Jehovah" is found in such connections that adherence to this rule becomes impracticable.

1) In ch. 14:22 Jehovah occurs in combination with El Elyon and in a passage universally regarded by the critics as not belonging to J and which some of them hesitatingly attribute to E. Here they have no resource but to eject "Jehovah" from the text, though the appropriateness and significance of the name in the connection confirm its genuineness. Abram's God is the same that Melchizedek worshiped, v. 19, with the addition of the special name, by which he was known to the chosen race. The omission of Jehovah from a few MSS. of the LXX. and from the Peshitto, to which Dillmann appeals, is doubtless due to transcribers conforming v. 22 to v. 19. That it is of no critical significance is plain from the fact that the LXX. repeatedly depart from the Hebrew text of Genesis in regard to the divine names, where the latter is clearly correct and universally conceded to be so.

2) The first chapter, in which Elohim is found, ch. 17, begins v. 1, "Jehovah appeared unto Abram." This identical expression occurs 12:7; 18:1; 26:2,24; and the accuracy of the text is further confirmed by Ex. 6:2,3, a passage of which the critics make great account. Yet because it is here inconsistent with their hypothesis, and for no other reason Jehovah is expunged and Elohim substituted for it.

3) The next chapter in which Elohim occurs with any frequency is ch. 20. But here again Jehovah has intruded itself in an unwelcome manner, v. 18, and the verse is summarily declared not to belong to this section in its original form, but to be a subsequent addition by R.

4) Ch. 21:1, Jehovah occurs in two successive clauses identical in signification. This is in violation of a critical dictum, of which extensive use is made, that repetitions of the same thought are indicative of distinct writers. Jehovah is accordingly erased in the second clause, Elohim is put in its place, and the clause is then attached to the latter end of the following sentence, which for other critical reasons has to be split in two. And by this sort of jugglery a sentence is manufactured for P out of parts of two distinct sentences, with a sentence of J thrust into the middle of it, and a shift is thus made, as will be pointed out hereafter, to evade certain other critical embarrassments, which could not be escaped by a less violent procedure.

5) In ch. 22 Elohim dominates. But in v. 2 it is necessary to get rid of "Moriah," since this name is a compound with Jehovah as one of its elements; though the critics are sorely puzzled to find a substitute, neither Moreh (Tuch), Hamorites (invented by Wellhausen in the sense of Shechemites on the basis of Gen. 33:19), nor Amorite (Dillmann) have gained acceptance. The eminent appropriateness of the temple mountain as the scene of Abraham's sacrifice is freely conceded by those, whose critical prepossessions compel them to regard it as a late interpolation. Consistency next obliges them to expunge v. 14 with its twice repeated "Jehovah" and its double allusion to the name Moriah. Further

in v. 11, "Jehovah" is erased and "Elohim" substituted, because the hypothesis requires it. For the same reason vs. 15-18 with its two-fold "Jehovah," though an essential part of the narrative, which manifestly lacks completeness without it, is magisterially declared to be an interpolation, the critics not being at one upon the question whether it is borrowed from a parallel account by J or is a free addition by R.

6) Again in 28:21 Jehovah inconveniently occurs in an Elohim connection, and the critics have no resource but to throw it out of the text as an interpolation, though by doing so they destroy the structure of the sentence. Verse 22 may very properly continue the apodosis begun by וְהָיָה in the rejected clause, but from the collocation of the words cannot introduce the apodosis, to which nevertheless it of necessity belongs. So at least Dillmann affirms.

2. The assumption that the names Elohim and Jehovah are indicative of distinct writers, inevitably leads to the parcelling of closely connected narratives and even of single sentences in a manner that is quite incredible. Thus :

1) In the sacrifice of Isaac the narrative has Elohim until the critical moment when Abraham takes the knife to slay his son, v. 10; but it is the angel of Jehovah, who arrests his hand and rewards his obedience by renewed promises of blessing more solemnly confirmed than ever before, vs. 11-18. Each of these portions presupposes the other and is unmeaning and incomplete without it. Astruc, Eichhorn and Gramberg are, however, consistent enough to assign vs. 1-10 to the Elohist and vs. 11 sqq. to the Jehovist, though Gramberg evidently felt the difficulty of the case; for he admits that it is quite impossible to account for such a close mutual correspondence of paragraphs taken from distinct treatises without the assumption that the compiler, instead of transcribing them verbatim, has adapted them to one another. So serious is this difficulty in fact that Tuch and all subsequent critics here shrink from the application of their own criteria and resort instead to an arbitrary change of text, as already explained in 1, 4).

2) In like manner Jacob's lying down to sleep and dreaming of the ladder with ascending and descending angels, 28:11,12, is referred to the Elohist, while Jehovah's address to him from the summit of it and Jacob's awaking out of sleep is given to the Jehovist, vs. 13-16, and the attempt is made by sundering the second portion from the first to give it a different meaning from that which it must necessarily have in its present connection, thus gratuitously charging the Redactor with perverting its sense, which not only makes the narrative in its existing form untrustworthy but destroys the basis on which they rest their own conclusions.

3) A yet more remarkable piece of patchwork is found in the account given of the birth of Jacob's children, 29:31-30:24. The story of the birth of Leah's first four sons is taken from J, of her next two from E, of Bilhah's two sons from E, or rather partly from E and partly from J as is inferred from other criteria

additional to the divine names, of Zilpah's two from J only, of Rachel's eldest son Joseph from P, J and E, all of whom conspire in constructing one sentence, 30:22, and finally of Rachel's youngest son Benjamin, 35:16-18, from JE, which means that the critics are unable to decide whether it is from J or E, or that these are so inextricably involved that it is impossible to separate them.

Further illustrations are unnecessary. Now, how paragraphs drawn from independent sources happen to fit together so exactly and to read as though written continuously by the same hand, or why a sensible Redactor should have constructed these and similar narratives in such a piecemeal fashion, it is difficult to understand.

3. It adds to the complication of the critical hypothesis, and creates a fresh demand for clear proofs of its reality, that it has been found necessary to assume two Elohist, one prior to Gen. 20, the other forming the great bulk of the Elohim sections from that to the end of the book. The criteria of Elohist and Jehovist gathered from the early part of Genesis prove inapplicable except in rare instances in the subsequent portion. This naturally engenders the suspicion that the criteria derived from the opening chapters are too hasty a generalization, based on insufficient data and falsified by the chapters that follow. Jehovah sections in the first of Genesis contain words and phrases and ideas, which it is claimed are peculiar to them and not found in contiguous Elohim sections. We continue our examination a few pages further and the alleged peculiarities of the Jehovist are repeated in Elohim sections to such a degree that no discrimination can be made between them but with the utmost difficulty. The natural conclusion would seem to be that this annuls the distinction between the Elohist and the Jehovist. This is evaded by claiming that there are two Elohist. If this is not to be regarded as a mere evasion, adequate proof must be given of their separate existence.

Ilgén's grotesque sundering of two Elohist met no acceptance, and there is reason to believe that it was abandoned by the author himself.* Hupfeld's later attempt in the same direction was carried through with great ingenuity but with an immense amount of hypercriticism. It was repelled at first as a retrograde movement.† But the sudden ascendancy of the revolutionary criticism which made P not the primary basis, but the latest constituent of Genesis and the Pentateuch, and so rendered the supplementary hypothesis impossible, led to the eager welcoming of Hupfeld's discovery of the separate and independent existence of J and E.

4. It is further to be borne in mind that it is only to a very inconsiderable extent that critical sections are determined by the divine names. Elohist and Jehovist sections and paragraphs are claimed without the occurrence of the corresponding divine name in either, and the limits of sections are very largely

* F. H. Ranke, *Untersuchungen über den Pentateuch*, I., p. 258, note.

† Delitzsch, *Commentar über die Genesis*, 3d edition, p. 42.

regulated by the sole pleasure of the critic. It is evident that a very wide door is thus opened for the admission of purely subjective considerations, and the criteria of Elohist and Jehovist so ascertained may easily be factitious and arbitrary, being dependent on adjustments made by the critics.

5. The divine names of the Book of Genesis do not require for their explanation the hypothesis of different writers; nor is the complexity of the subject relieved by such a hypothesis. On the contrary it adds seriously to the embarrassments and the difficulties of the case. General biblical usage discriminates between **אלהים** and **יהוה** in a manner corresponding to the character and the signification of these names. In some connections Elohim is the only appropriate term, in others Jehovah, and in others still either is admissible. The employment of the divine names in Genesis can be satisfactorily explained, if the same liberty is allowed there that is observable in other books of the Bible or even in the so-called J sections of Genesis itself. An attempt will be made to show this hereafter in detail. It is, however, explicitly conceded by Tuch,* who nevertheless objects that this still leaves unexplained the limitation of each of these names to special sections having a peculiar diction and range of ideas, as well as the continuity of the Elohim sections. He was unable to find a like continuity in the J sections, though later critics claim to have discovered it, and to have discovered likewise that the Elohim sections which he thought homogeneous and continuous are really neither, but are made up of two dissimilar and wholly independent constituents P and E. We proceed to examine whether there is such a continuity in either of these classes of sections or such peculiarities of thought and language as warrant the acceptance of the divisive hypothesis in any of its forms.

SEC. 5. GEN. 12:6-17:27.

A. The Divine Names.

The name Jehovah is used throughout chs. 12-16; Elohim does not occur until ch. 17, where it is found repeatedly and with the exception of v. 1 exclusively. These names are in every instance used appropriately and with evident design. The alternation is so significant and grows so directly out of the circumstances of the case and the whole plan of the history, that it cannot possibly be the accidental result of blending together separate Elohist and Jehovist documents.

Jehovah is the name by which the God of the chosen race is distinctively known. It is accordingly Jehovah who bids Abram leave his kindred and his father's house, 12:1,4, with the promise to multiply his seed and to give him Canaan, 12:2,7; 13:14-17, to whom Abram erected altars in this land and paid his worship, 12:7,8; 13:4,18, who guarded Sarai, Abram's wife, 12:17, who noted and would punish the guilty occupants of the promised land, 13:10,13; 15:16, to whom Abram appealed as the universal sovereign, 14:22, who appeared to Abram,

* *Commentar über die Genesis*, 2d edition, p. xxxvii.

12:7, spake to him, 12:1,4,7; 13:14; ch. 15, and covenanted with him, 15:18, whom Sarai recognized as directing all that affected her, 16:2,5, who cared for Hagar as a member of Abram's family, 16:7 sqq., though in the mouth of this Egyptian maid, 16:13, as well as in the name of her son, 16:11,15, we find not Jehovah but El. The critics profess to find fragments of P in these chapters, but by what lucky accident has it occurred that Elohim does not once appear in any such fragment to break the constant regularity with which Jehovah is introduced as guiding, blessing and guarding Abram and all that belongs to him, and as the object of his worship? How comes it to pass that Elohim is thus steadfastly reserved for ch. 17, where it is as plainly demanded by the situation, as Jehovah had been in all that preceded?

But, it may be asked, is it not still Jehovah, the God of the chosen race, who enters into covenant with Abraham and who establishes circumcision as the seal of that covenant and the perpetual badge of the covenant people? It is Jehovah, who appears to Abram and engages in this solemn transaction with him, as is expressly declared v. 1. The critics here dispute the genuineness of the word "Jehovah" for no other reason than that it conflicts with their hypothesis. The text bears intrinsic evidence of correctness as it stands. Jehovah announces himself as the Almighty God, and the reason for this is obvious. The promise of a numerous seed made to Abram at the outset had been repeated from time to time for four and twenty years, and there had been as yet no indication of its fulfilment. Meanwhile in his advancing age and that of Sarai, all natural hope of offspring had vanished. The time has now come when his persistent faith shall be rewarded. The promise is on the eve of accomplishment. Nature has failed, but the divine omnipotence is all sufficient. Isaac shall be born the next year; and in anticipation of this event Abram is required to circumcise his household and thus express his confidence in the assurance given him. The emphasis here laid on God's almighty power is indicated by El Shaddai, v. 1, followed by Elohim, the title of the God of creation, throughout the interview and to the end of the chapter.

B. The Critical Partition.

The critics endeavor to make out a show of continuity for P in the history of Abraham by picking out a sentence here and there from ch. 12-16, sundering it from its connection and transferring it to P. But they have no better reason and are no more successful in this than in their attempt to establish the continuity of J in the narrative of the flood, see pp. 168,169.* In order to bridge the chasm from ch. 11 to ch. 17 six verses and parts of three others, referring to the principal events that had taken place in the interval, are rent from their proper context and

* All references not otherwise specified are to HEBRAICA, Vol. V.

claimed for P, viz., Abram's removal from Haran to the land of Canaan, 12:4b,5;* his separation from Lot, 13:6,11b,12a; his connection with Hagar, 16:1,3; and the birth of Ishmael, vs. 15,16. These verses and clauses fit perfectly in their context, and no one would ever dream that they had been inserted from another document but for the necessity laid upon the critics to discover something that could be attributed to P, which might explain the situation in ch. 17 (viz., Abraham's presence in Canaan, v. 8, his son Ishmael, vs. 18,20, born thirteen years before, v. 25, though Sarah had no child, vs. 17,19), as well as Lot's abode in the cities of the plain, 19:29. But notwithstanding this urgent motive Ilgen (1798) is, so far as I know, the only critic prior to Hupfeld (1853), who could find any indication of P in chs. 13; 15; 16. Astruc, Eichhorn, Gramberg, Stähelin, Delitzsch (1st edition), and even Vater with his fragmentary proclivities, were equally unable to sunder anything from ch. 12. Tuch (1838) suggested doubtfully in his exposition, though with more confidence in the introduction to his commentary, that 12:5 belonged to P on a ground which subsequent critics have annulled, viz., its resemblance to 36:6 and 46:6, which are in a context referred by him to P, but denied by others to be his.†

1. Chapter 12:4b,5.

The reference of 12:4b,5 to P is argued by Hupfeld and others on the following grounds:

1. Because v. 5 repeats 4a. But

1) Nothing is more common in the Hebrew historians than repetitions of this sort where no one imagines that there is a diversity of writers. A general statement of obedience to the divine command, v. 4a, is followed by a more particular account of what was done in accordance with it, v. 5. So Gen. 7:5,7 sqq.; 37:5-8; 41:45c,46; 42:20c,24,26 sqq.; Judg. 4:15c,17; 1 Sam. 17:49,50; 2 Sam. 15:16,17; 2 Kgs. 11:16,20.

2) Verse 5 is indispensable to make the connection between vs. 4a and 6. In 4a Abram goes forth it is not said whither. In v. 6 he is already in Canaan and passing through it. It is presupposed that he had arrived there and that the

* These verses are considered here in connection with the passage to which they properly belong, although by the division adopted from Prof. Harper they are referred to the preceding section.

† An apt illustration is here afforded of the facility with which critics by slightly shifting the lines of division can serve a purpose which they have in view or can alter the complexion of the alleged documents with which they are dealing. Tuch (*Genesis*², p. xliii, note) was inclined to assign 12:5,6,8; 13:18 to P. This would account for the place of Sarah's death and burial, 23:2,19, which otherwise there is nothing in P to explain. Knobel reaches a like result by giving P 12:4b,5,6,8a,9. The connection in J was thus broken, but that was no objection on the supplementary hypothesis, of which they were advocates, that J was not an independent document, but consisted of sections and paragraphs added to P. Schrader gives 6a,8a,9 to E on the ground that one from the northern kingdom of Israel, as he is assumed to be, would feel more interest in associating Abram with Shechem and Bethel, than J from the kingdom of Judah. Dillmann objects that 6b and 8b cannot be separated from 6a and 8a, an objection equally valid, as is shown in the text, against his own removal of v. 5, which is a necessary link between v. 4 and v. 6.

name of the country has been made known to the reader and need not be repeated. But the missing statements on these points are only found in v. 5.

2. 12:5b is parallel to 11:31b and evidently its continuation.

This is unhesitatingly admitted and is quite consistent with the unity of the book, of which it is a natural sequence.

3. Verse 5 has words and phrases peculiar to P.

The following instances are adduced, viz.:

תָּקַף *took* as in 11:31; 36:6; 46:6. But it is used in the same manner in J, 8:20; 12:19; 24:51; 32:23,24; 43:13; 47:2; and in E, 20:14; 22:3; 45:18,19.

רָכַשׁ *goods* and שָׁרַף *to get* are claimed as undoubted characteristics of P, but as it would appear on very slender grounds. The verb and noun occur together in four passages, Gen. 12:6; 31:18; 36:6; 46:6; and the noun alone in six other places in Genesis and twice besides in the rest of the Pentateuch. The critics themselves refer it six times to another than P, Gen. 14:11,12,16,21; 15:14; Num. 16:32. Once and once only it stands in a context by common consent referred to P, Num. 35:3. In every other instance the verse or paragraph in which it is found is cut out of a J or E context, or one of disputed origin, and is assigned to P mainly

because of this very word, which is arbitrarily assumed to belong to him.

שִׁפְיָן *person* is not peculiar to P, as appears from its occurrence in Gen. 2:7; 14:21; Deut. 10:22; 24:7; 27:25; Josh. 10:28-39; 11:11; not to speak of Gen. 46:15-27, which several eminent critics ascribe to another than P. Dillmann (*Genesis*, p. 219) remarks that "it was scarcely possible to avoid using שִׁפְיָן for persons of both sexes free and slave."

אֶרֶץ כְּנָעַן *land of Canaan* is classed as characteristic of P; but it occurs repeatedly in both J and E, viz., 42:5,7,13,29,32; 44:8; 45:17,25; 46:31; 47:1,4,13,14,15; 50:5. It is used to designate the land promised to Abram, 17:8, in contrast with Haran from which he came, 12:5; 16:3; and the cities of the plain selected by Lot, 13:12.

4. This statement could not have been lacking in P.

This is a frank avowal of the motive by which the critics are actuated in rending v. 5 from its connection. But instead of an argument for the hypothesis, it is simply a confession of the straits to which it is reduced.

5. The mention of Abram's age in v. 4b is held to be a sufficient reason for ascribing it to P. But

1) The critics as a rule impute dates and statements of men's ages to P, even though the context, in which these are imbedded, is derived by them from some other document, as here and 41:46. But the refusal to credit any writer but P with such a statement, when occurring naturally in the course of a paragraph attributed to him is an arbitrary procedure, in which the critics largely deal, and amounts to determining in advance what each document must be instead of seeking fairly to discover what it really is. Inconsistently enough, where a different motive operates, they allow that E recorded Joseph's age, Gen. 50:22,26; and that of Joshua, Josh. 24:29, in which P as a native of Judah is presumed to have less interest. If the various statements of the ages of the patriarchs, when put together, yield a consistent chronology, this is no excuse for critical surgery, but

is simply one indication more that the Book of Genesis is woven together too firmly to be rent asunder, except by a violence which will destroy the fabric.

2) 4b presupposes 4a. It is not a statement that Abram went forth from Haran, but a declaration of his age at the time, implying that the fact of his having done so had been already mentioned; and for this reason it cannot connect with 11:31, as the critics propose, where no such affirmation is made.

2. Chapter 13:6,11b,12a.

In favor of assigning 13:6,11b,12a to P it is urged

1. Verse 6 is superfluous beside the detailed account of the separation, vs. 7 sqq.

But this disregards the frequent usage of Hebrew writers to state first in a summary manner, what is subsequently unfolded in detail. Thus Judg. 20:35,36a precedes the more particular recital, vs. 36b-46; 1 Kgs. 5:9 is expanded in vs. 10-14 (A. V. 4:29 in vs. 30-34); 6:14 in vs. 15-36; 11:3b in vs. 4-8; 2 Kgs. 21:2 in vs. 3-9. See also the examples of a like nature given under the preceding head.

2. Its close correspondence with 36:7.

The expressions used in the two passages are almost identical, which speaks strongly for their common authorship, which we too affirm and insist upon in the interest of the unity of the book. This is no argument for diversity of documents, nor that v. 6 belongs to any other than its present context.

3. 11b is unnecessary after 11a; and 12a represents Lot as having a fixed abode, while according to 11a and 12b he led the wandering life of a nomad in tents.

But after the mention of Lot's removal eastward it was still important to state distinctly that this effected a separation between him and Abram. Kautzsch and Socin substantially confess this when they assume that J here made explicit mention of Abram's remaining in Canaan, which R omitted with a view to adopting P's similar statement in v. 12. And as to the alleged diversity in Lot's mode of life, it is plain that R or whoever gave the text its present form saw none, or he would not have joined mutually inconsistent clauses without explanation. Such diversity, if it existed, would prove inconvenient to the critics; for in ch. 19 (J) Lot is not leading a tent life, but dwelling in one of the cities of the plain, in accordance with what they here assign to P, but conflicting with what they assign to J. Where is the difficulty in assuming as both 13:6,12a (P) and 13:12b; ch. 19 (J) require that Lot took up his quarters in one of the cities, while those in charge of his flocks lived in tents on the plains?

4. "Cities of the plain," 13:12, corresponds with the expression in 19:29 P, as against 13:10,11, "the plain of Jordan," and 12b, "Sodom," expressions of J.

But a purely factitious difference is created here by arbitrarily dividing a sentence, and giving part to one document and part to another. "The plain of

Jordan" differs from "Sodom," as much as the latter differs from "the cities of the plain;" so that if the latter can be plead in proof of diversity of authorship, the former may likewise, and it would follow that what the critics here assign to J should be partitioned between two different writers. "The plain of Jordan" only occurs 13:10,11; elsewhere it is simply "the plain" alike in 19:17,25,28 assigned to J, and in 13:12; 19:29 assigned to P. Moreover according to J 13:10; 19:24,25,28; cf. 10:19, there was more than one city in the plain, so that P's phrase is completely justified. And that J should name these cities while P does not precisely reverses what we were told (p. 32) of the characteristics of these two writers, that "J employs sparingly proper names."

5. These verses have words and phrases peculiar to P.

אֶרֶץ כְּנָעַן and רְכִישׁ have been discussed already. So has עִיר הַפְּלִי have been discussed already. So has עִיר הַפְּלִי cities of the plain, which only occurs 13:12; 19:29, cf. v. 25.

נָשָׂא to bear 13:16, is claimed by Dillmann for P, by which he can only mean that it occurs once, though only once, in a precisely similar connection, 36:7. The verb itself occurs repeatedly in J and E. It is used in the sense of bearing in J, Gen. 4:13; 7:17; Num. 11:14; 14:33; so in E, Ex. 18:22.

יָשַׁב to dwell, 13:6-12, is also claimed for P by Dillmann, whereas it occurs repeatedly in J and E, not only in other applications, but with

express reference to the patriarchs in Canaan, J, 13:18; 19:30 (Lot); 25:11b; 26:6,17; E, Gen. 20:1,15; 19; 36:1.

פָּרַךְ 13:11b was claimed for P where it occurred Gen. 10:5,32, p. 25 (also p. 44, Language of J, under 9:19), but it is to be found likewise in J, 13:9,14, which stand in such close connection with 11b that these must form one continuous context; so also 25:23; 30:40, not to speak of 2:10, where it is in a J passage but arbitrarily referred to R. Dr. Harper has wisely refrained from adducing these words here.

The assertion that 19:29 has been transposed from its proper position and that it was originally attached to 13:12a is altogether groundless and merely betrays the embarrassment created by the critical processes which sunder it from the connection in which it stands, and to which, as we shall see hereafter, it is firmly bound both by its matter and form, the change in the divine name being for a sufficient reason and not suggestive of a different writer.

3. 16:1, 3, 15, 16.

The critics are puzzled as to the disposition to be made of 16:1. Knobel gives it to P; Kautzsch follows Schrader in giving 1a to P and 1b to J; Wellhausen and Dillmann agree that the whole verse is J's; Hupfeld seems uncertain. On the one hand it is urged that "Sarai Abram's wife," "her husband Abram," "Hagar her maid the Egyptian," v. 3, needlessly repeat what is contained in v. 1; these verses must, therefore, be from different sources. But on the other hand, v. 3 necessarily presupposes a previous mention of Hagar and of Sarai's childlessness, such as is found in v. 1, and the identity of expressions favors sameness of authorship rather than the reverse, so that they must belong together. Sarai's relation to Abram is not here mentioned for the first time in either document, as

the critics divide them, P, 11:31; 12:5; J, 11:29; 12:11,17. It is not stated, then, for the sake of acquainting the reader with a fact not before known. But it is reiterated and dwelt upon at this juncture, that it may be kept before the mind in order to a proper understanding of the situation. That Hagar was Sarai's maid and an Egyptian is also important for the correct comprehension of the subsequent history. Hence it is not only repeated here but elsewhere in all the documents, as the critics regard them, J, 16:8; E, 21:9; P, 25:12. There is accordingly no escape from the admission of repetitions but by the indefinite multiplication of documents. The triple statement, 16:15,16, that Hagar bare Ishmael is not due to diffuseness of style but emphasizes the fact that he was not Sarai's child.

But if v. 1 is accorded to P, because presupposed in v. 3, then the narrative in J evidently lacks its beginning. It has no suitable introduction, and the reference to Sarai's maid, v. 2, and to Hagar, v. 4, imply that she had been spoken of before. Even splitting v. 1 between the documents will not mend the matter, for as Kautzsch admits, "By the reception of v. 1a from P the beginning of J's text is cut away." That 16:1a repeats 11:30 is not suggestive of distinct documents any more than similar repetitions which abound elsewhere.* The trial of Abram's faith lay largely in this that notwithstanding the repeated promises of a numerous offspring, Sarai continued childless. It was this which led to the expedient here detailed. It was proper, therefore, that this fact though mentioned before should be repeated in this place.

And v. 3 is not superfluous after v. 2. Sarai first spoke to Abram and obtained his consent; she then took measures to give effect to her scheme. The dates, vs. 3,16, do not indicate another writer than the author of the rest of the chapter, except on the arbitrary assumption that the latter could not mention dates. Nor is there any significance in the circumstance that in v. 15 it is the father, whereas in v. 11 it is the mother who gives name to the child. It is alleged, p. 249 2 (6), that the former is characteristic of P, the latter of J. But this rule does not hold. J makes Seth, 4:26, Judah, 38:3, and Moses, Ex. 2:22, name their children. And of so little account is it to which parent this act is referred, that in 4:25,26 J they alternate in successive verses, and in 35:18 E both occur in the same verse and in respect to the same child, while in 25:25,26; 29:34; 38:29,30 (all J) the naming is ascribed to neither but spoken of indefinitely. The closing verses are moreover essential to the integrity of the chapter. If they

* Compare 1 Sam. 1:3, 4:4; 2:11,18, 3:1; 2:21b,26, 3:19; 13:15b, 14:2b; 16:6-11, 17:2,19; 25:1, 28:3; 2 Sam. 2:11, 5:5; 3:21c,22c; 14:24,28; 1 Kgs. 14:21c,31b; 15:16,32; 2 Kgs. 1:1, 3:5; 8:29, 9:15, 16. These examples as well as most of those previously given are adopted from an early publication of Ewald, his *Komposition der Genesis*, 1823, which is still worthy of attentive perusal, and in which he argues more wisely than in his later speculations. There is much truth in his suggestion that many of the critical objections to the unity of Genesis arise from applying to it modern and occidental standards, and disregarding the usages of Hebrew historiography and that of the ancient Orient generally.

be sundered from it and given to P, the result will be that while J records Sarai's anxiety to have children by her maid, Abram's assent to her wishes, Hagar's pregnancy, and the angel's promise of a son, whom he names and characterizes, yet the point of the whole narrative is never reached. J makes no mention of the birth of Hagar's child. So that his story, as the critics furnish it to us, has neither beginning nor end. We are left to presume that it once had these missing parts, corresponding to what the critics have cut away, but that R removed them to make room for statements to the same effect from P. Why he should have done this does not appear; especially as at other times he is represented to be so careful to preserve every scrap from his sources as to insert what the critics deem superfluous, regardless of the fact that it interrupts the connection and adds nothing to what had been said before.

That לָקַח, יָשָׁב, and אֶרֶץ כְּנָעַן, v. 3, are not peculiar to P was shown under 1) 3 and 2) 5. Hupfeld notices the fact that וְשָׁמָּה *whose name was*, v. 1, elsewhere occurs only in J (though he is said, p. 32, to be sparing in his

use of proper names) Gen. 22:24; 25:1; 38:6; Josh. 2:1, so וְשָׁמָּה, Gen. 24:29; 38:1,2; but this does not seem to have ended the strife among the critics as to the origin of that verse.

4. Chapter 17.

Chapter 17 cannot be sundered from what precedes and follows, as an extract from an entirely independent document. It is most intimately related to the whole narrative of which it is a part. Its explicit allusion to antecedent events oblige the critics to link it with statements of their occurrence, and thus by means of scattered and disjointed sentences to make out for P a show of continuity. With how little reason and success this is done, we have already seen. But even if the analysis, which they propose, were better supported, it does not meet the case. It is not sufficient that there should be a bald mention of Abram's arrival in Canaan and of the birth of Ishmael. The significance of these facts in the life of Abram and the entire course of training, to which he had been subjected, as this is set forth in the whole antecedent narrative, are necessary preliminaries to this chapter. Its form cannot be accounted for nor can its contents be understood without it.

The one leading idea in the life of Abram is the trial of his faith, that he might become the father of the faithful. Jehovah bade him leave his country and his father's house, promising to give him possession of a land and to make of him a great nation; and this though the land was already occupied by Canaanites and his wife was childless. His faith was soon tried by a grievous famine which obliged him to leave the land and go down to Egypt, where a new trial awaited him in the peril of losing Sarai. She was rescued by divine interference and he was restored to Canaan enriched, but the promised seed was not born. In the long waiting he began to apprehend that his steward, Eliezer, would be his heir.

But the promise was made more definite that he should have a child of his own body, not merely a son by adoption, and that his offspring should be as numerous as the stars, and to confirm his faith in his future possession of the land, Jehovah entered into a formal covenant with him, sealing the engagement by a visible symbol of the divine presence. Ten weary years had worn away, and still Sarai had no child. At her suggestion he took Hagar, thinking thus to obtain the promised son. Ishmael was born and had reached his thirteenth year, when the promise was made more definite still, and the announcement was given that his long deferred hope was now to be fulfilled. Not his handmaid but his wife, not Hagar but Sarai should be the mother of the promised seed. The covenant, which had already been ratified on one side, must now be ratified on the other. Abraham signifies his faith in the divine announcement, and binds himself and his household in covenant with God by the seal of circumcision, and this in anticipation of Isaac's birth. This final ratification of the covenant is followed by Jehovah's condescending to the usages of man and coming in human form to feast with Abraham at the door of his tent, where the promise is repeated in the hearing of Sarah, and Jehovah makes confidential communication of his purpose to Abraham, and admits Abraham on the footing of this newly-confirmed friendship to the intimacy of persistent and prevalent intercession.

If ever a narrative bore in itself the evidence of inviolable unity, in which every part fits precisely in its place in the plan of the whole, and is indissolubly linked with every other, all breathing one spirit, contributing to one end, working out one common design, to which each and every item is indispensable, and defying all attempts to rend it asunder, this is the case with the life of Abraham as recorded in the Book of Genesis. Though it is told with a charming simplicity and apparent artlessness, the divine purpose rules in the whole, and rivets all together with hooks of steel, which no critical art can sever.

We are asked to believe that all this close correspondence and evident adjustment of the several parts is but the result of a lucky accident. Two or rather three documents, written quite independently of each other, with entirely distinct aims and frequently at variance in their details, have happened to be so constructed, that extracts taken from them could be dove-tailed together, and yield all the evidence of a consistently constructed, regularly developing scheme, which reaches its most pathetic climax when the faithful patriarch proves his obedience in the last and sharpest trial of all by taking the knife to slay his son, and the approving voice from heaven stays his hand and confirms the promises previously given by the unheard of solemnity of the oath of Jehovah swearing by himself.

Is it a supposable thing that ch. 17 has been extracted from a document, which, as the critics tell us, knows nothing of any previous divine communication made to Abraham? which on the contrary, represents him as having migrated to Canaan of his own motion, and from no divine impulse, no promises

having been made to him, and no measures taken to discipline his faith? So viewed it no longer has the emphasis of being preceded by a series of promises of growing definiteness and clearness, which gradually lead up to it, but is absolutely not only the first but the only revelation which God makes to Abraham his whole life long.

Regard it as a final and more explicit promise intended to cut off all previous misunderstandings, and to assure him that he should have not an adopted son, as 12:2 might permit him to suppose that his retinue, 14:14, should swell to a nation; not even a son of his own by his handmaid as 15:4 might be interpreted; but a son by his own wife notwithstanding her long continued barrenness; then it will be easy to understand why, instead of a simple promise in a few words like that first given, 12:2,7, it is dwelt upon and reiterated, 17:2-8, and why Sarai is so emphatically referred to, and with such repetition as the mother of the expected child, vs. 15,16,19,21. Then, too, there is an obvious fitness in Abraham's being required to ratify on his own part by a special rite the covenant which Jehovah had previously ratified himself by a visible symbol. And there is likewise a special significance in Jehovah's revealing himself as God Almighty and Elohim (the God of creation) to Abraham, who has been kept in such long expectancy, till every natural hope of offspring had vanished. His omnipotent word can accomplish all that he says. All this is intelligible and in place, if the promise is a last emphatic utterance to one, whom hope deferred has tempted to misinterpret former declarations or to grow despondent in respect to their fulfilment.

But as the first and only promise made of God to Abraham, its whole character and structure are unexplained. The iteration must then be, as the critics in fact regard it, mere verbose diffuseness characteristic of P. El Shaddai and Elohim became the mere habit of a writer, who uses no other appellation of God prior to the Mosaic period. And by sheer accident this verbose diffuseness and this habit of using Elohim yield precisely the emphasis and the form needed to crown the whole series of promises of ever growing fulness and precision, recorded by another writer of whom P knew nothing and whose views he did not share. *Credat Wellhausen, non ego.*

And, further, ch. 18 is just as unintelligible without ch. 17, as the latter is apart from the chapters that precede it. The transaction there recorded is without a parallel in Scripture. It cannot be dismissed as only another instance of J's extraordinary anthropomorphisms or put on a parallel with heathen myths. There is nothing like it elsewhere in J. Its remarkable and solitary character implies a very unusual occasion. The occasion was in fact absolutely unique. It was the solemnization of the covenant transacted between God and Abraham as the father of the chosen race. It was the starting point of that scheme of grace, by which a people was separated from the rest of the world to be for the time the depository of God's truth and ordinances with a view to the ultimate salvation of

the world. The nearest Scripture parallel is that in which Jehovah, who here covenanted with Abraham, renewed his covenant with his descendants increased to a nation at Mount Sinai, Ex. 24:7,8, which was followed by a sacred meal in which the representatives of the people ate and drank in the immediate presence of the God of Israel visibly manifested before them, vs. 9-11. So here Jehovah in human form came to the tent of Abraham and ate of his food in token of friendly intimacy established, as men who had covenanted were in the habit of eating together in recognition of their oneness and their amicable relations, Gen. 31:44,45. Put this unique act of condescension in connection with the unique relation between God and man just consummated, and all is plain. Sunder it with the critics from the immediately preceding transaction and the peculiarity of this visit to Abraham has no meaning and is without an object.

The section next preceding in J is the story of Hagar, which suggests no explanation of this extraordinary visit.* Is this another instance of the combination of unrelated writings, chancing to impart a profound significance to what in its original position was unmeaning, not to say grotesque? The evidently inseparable connection of this whole narrative supplies an argument of unity, which everyone who reads it can appreciate, and which cannot be set aside by any amount of critical reasoning from microscopic details.

It is further observable that up to 17:5,15, the name of the patriarch is uniformly Abram, and that of his wife Sarai; thenceforward they are Abraham and Sarah irrespective of documents. This is a plain indication of unity, which the critics seek to escape by assuming a systematic alteration throughout by R to conform to this passage. Note also the clear allusion 18:14, J, (לְמוֹעֵד) to 17:12, P, cf. also 21:2. Other allusions and links of connection with ch. 21 will be considered hereafter.

5. Incompleteness of P.

1. According to the representation of the critics P relates with some particularity two events in the life of Abraham, viz., the institution of circumcision, ch. 17, and the purchase of the field in Machpelah, ch. 23. Beyond this there is absolutely nothing respecting him but the record of his death and burial, 25:7-11, and a few scattered sentences, such as we have reviewed, torn from their connection, because P contained allusions to facts which made it necessary to discover some scanty mention of them which could be assigned to him. In regard to Isaac and Jacob P is more fragmentary still. No paragraph of any length is anywhere to be found. A few disjointed, and for the most part unrelated, sentences compose the

* Nor is it explained by the covenant in ch. 15, which De Wette (*Beiträge*, II., p. 77) affirms to be another form of the myth in ch. 17. An interval of years is presupposed by ch. 16, which must necessarily follow ch. 15 and precede ch. 18. In ch. 15, God gives to Abram a pledge and assurance of his own engagement. It is only when as the counterpart to this Abram in ch. 17 testifies his faith in God and adds his seal to the covenant, that the way is prepared for the covenant meal in ch. 18.

whole. The supplementary hypothesis here had the advantage of being able to claim with some plausibility, that while P had little to say respecting their more remote ancestors, Abraham and Isaac, he dwelt with special interest upon Jacob, the immediate progenitor of the children of Israel, and his narrative here became full and minute. But the discovery of another Elohist (E), and especially the attempt, which has of late been pushed to the greatest lengths, to fritter away the patriarchal history by parcelling it into legendary tales reflecting the prejudices or partialities of later times, have swept away the greater part of the P document, leaving but a trifling portion of what was once ascribed to it. J's preference for the name Jehovah, and P's attachment to the ritual legislation mark them as Judeans. E on the other hand is an Ephraimite, and felt an interest in Joseph and in such localities as Bethel, Shechem, etc., which citizens of the southern kingdom could not be expected to share. P avoids these themes and in consequence his account of the three great patriarchs becomes to the last degree jejune and incoherent.

The result is a natural sequence of the perversion of the history and of the attempted partition, and may fairly be regarded as a *reductio ad absurdum* in respect to both. This will more fully appear in the sequel. For the present it is sufficient to indicate the lacunae, which have thus far appeared in the section now under review. P's history of Abraham is almost a total blank from the time of his father's settlement in Haran, 11:31, until the year before the birth of Isaac, ch. 17, when he had been twenty-four years in Canaan and had been subjected to a long series of trials for the discipline of his faith. These are presupposed in ch. 17, but are absolutely ignored in the six verses and three clauses, which are all that are attributed to P during the period to which they belong. These verses and clauses are, moreover, rent without sufficient justification from a context where they cannot be spared; and their removal leaves J's story of Hagar with neither beginning nor end, and strikes from it the birth of Ishmael altogether.

2. Another palpable instance of incompleteness is afforded by the history of Lot. The critical division renders P's mention of Lot altogether nugatory. P particularly records his parentage and his relation to Abram, 11:27; his accompanying Terah and Abram from Ur of the Chaldees to Haran, v. 31; his going thence with Abram to Canaan, 12:5; his large property and retinue, 13:6; his parting from Abram and dwelling in the cities of the plain, vs. 11,12; the deliverance granted him for Abram's sake when God destroyed these cities, 19:29. And there he disappears. The very point and purpose of the whole narrative is not reached,* viz., that from Lot sprang the tribes of Moab and Ammon, which are thus in accordance with the uniform plan of Genesis removed like Ishmael, the

* Wellhausen remarks (*Composition des Hexateuchs*, p. 15): "Nöldeke calls attention to a break in Q (P): he must without doubt have connected the two nations of Moab and Ammon with Lot, who in and of himself has no significance."

descendants of Keturah and Esau beyond the limits of the promised land, that it may remain in the undisturbed possession of the chosen race. The missing paragraph containing the key to the significance of Lot, 19:30-38, is ascribed to J; but his account, too, is mutilated, if not at the end, at the beginning. Lot is suddenly introduced, 12:4a, with no intimation of who he was and no previous mention of him.

3. P's account of Abram's removal from Haran begins abruptly, 12:4b, and in a manner which implies that something is missing. The statement that "Abram was seventy and five years old when he departed out of Haran" presupposes that this departure had been already mentioned. And so in fact it is in what immediately precedes, vs. 1-4a. But this we are told belongs to J. So that it is necessary to assume that the preliminary part of P's narrative has been omitted and these verses from J substituted for it. The attempt has been made to confirm this by alleging that the title "These are the generations of Abram" must originally have stood at the beginning of Abram's life* in P, as in the case of Isaac, 25:20, and Jacob, 37:2, since a separate section must have been devoted to this greatest of the patriarchs, instead of including him under "the generations of Terah," whose life is brought to a formal close in the preceding chapter, 11:32; but that R in replacing the opening words of P by those of J dropped the title of the former as well. Plausible as this may sound it is clearly a mistake. For

1) Even if such a substitution had been made, it would not account for the omission of the title, had it been appropriate and originally stood there; for like titles occur at the head of sections which are wholly J's, 2:4, or in whose opening chapters there is not a single sentence from P.

2) The succeeding history deals not only with Abram, but with other descendants of Terah as well, who are accordingly for this reason introduced to the reader at the outset, 11:27,29, viz., Lot, who journeyed with Abram to Canaan, and Nahor, whose descendants are recited without a separate title, 22:20-24, preparatory to the marriage of Isaac into this family of his kindred, ch. 24.

3) The generations of Abram would be an unsuitable designation of a history, the emphasis and interest of which for several successive chapters turns upon the patriarch's childlessness.

4. The same thing further appears from 25:19, where the genealogy is linked directly with 11:27 by beginning, "Abraham begat Isaac."

No title has been dropped, therefore, from the beginning of ch. 12; consequently no presumption can be drawn from that source in favor of different narrators. It may be added that as 12:4b requires 4a to make it intelligible, and this is indissolubly bound to vs. 1-3, so 12:1 is linked as firmly with the preceding chapter. J's account cannot have begun with 12:1 (Delitzsch), nor with 11:29

* So Knobel, Wellhausen, Dillmann and others following a suggestion of Ewald in his review of Delitzsch on Genesis in his *Jahrbücher d. Bibl. Wissenschaft* for 1851-2, p. 40.

(Dillmann), for in either case Abram is introduced abruptly and without explanation; both require that 11:27 P should precede them. Thus P is linked with J, and J with P, each dependent on the other to supply the needed explanation of what it contains, neither complete without the other, both fitting accurately together and precisely filling each other's gaps. Is this seamless and harmonious production a piece of patchwork? Can extracts from wholly independent documents be made to match in this manner, however skilfully arranged? And how do these repeated omissions, now from one document, now from the other, which must of necessity be assumed by the advocates of the current critical hypothesis, comport with what is alleged of the conduct of R elsewhere, his concern to preserve the briefest and most scanty statements of his sources, even when they add nothing to fuller narratives drawn from elsewhere, the insertion being detected by its being a superfluous and unmeaning duplication? cf. 7:13-16; 9:18,19; 13:6, 11b,12a; 19:29.

1) LANGUAGE OF P.

For convenience of reference the arrangement and numbers are adopted from p. 244.

OLD WORDS.

- (1) רכוש explained, under 12:4b,5.
- (2) הַתְּהִלָּה in the phrase *walk before God*, 17:1 (analogous to, though differing from *walk with God*, 5:22,24; 6:9 P), occurs nowhere else in P, and but twice besides in Pent. 24:40 J; 48:15 E, both with explicit reference to this passage; see also p. 174 (6:9).
- (3) תָּמִיד explained p. 174 (6:9).
- (4) רָבָה not peculiar to P; in J Gen. 7:17; 38:12; 48:34; in J or E Ex. 1:10,12,20; in Hiphil as 17:2,20 only 28:3; 48:4; Ex. 7:3 in P; but Gen. 3:16 J; 15:1 JE; 16:10 R in J context; 22:17 R in E context; 26:4(R),24 J; Ex. 32:13 J; Lev. 26:9 J (Dill.); Josh. 24:3 E.
- (5) כָּאֵד also in J 30:43, as stated p. 174 (7:19).
- (6) אֱלֹהִים explained above.
- (7) הִנֵּה three times in Genesis, 6:17; 9:9; 17:4; twice in Exodus, 14:17; 31:6; three times in Numbers, 3:12; 18:6,8, only of God announcing something of special moment in the history or the ritual. All are referred to P, though in Ex. 14 P, J and E seem to be inextricably intermingled.
- (8) פָּרָה not peculiar to P; in J Gen. 26:22; 49:22; Lev. 26:9; in E Gen. 41:52; Ex. 23:30; and Gen. 47:27, though assigned to P, is cut out of a J context.

(9) הָקִים בְּרִית and בְּרִית נָתַן, see p. 174 (6:18).

(10) נָתַן for שָׁם or שִׁית, see p. 152.

(11) זָרַע * אַחֲרָי seed after, 17:7-10; but P also uses "seed with," Gen. 28:4; Num. 18:19; and simply "seed," Ex. 30:21. If this argues no diversity of authorship, why should it in Gen. 13:15; 26:3; 28:13 J? Cf. Dt. 1:8 with 11:9 both D (Dill.), and 1 Sam. 20:42 with 24:21.

(12) דָּרוֹת plur. in P to denote perpetuity of institutions, see p. 174 (6:9). E and J use the plur. when they have occasion to do so, Ex. 12:42 E (Dill.); Josh. 22:27,28 JE.

(13) בְּרִית עוֹלָם in four passages of Pent. to denote the perpetuity of the covenant with Noah, Gen. 9:16; Abraham, Gen. 17:7,13,19; and Israel, Ex. 31:16; Lev. 24:8. All P.

(14) זָכַר in J, Ex. 13:12,15; cf. 34:23; also Gen. 7:3,9 where it is arbitrarily referred to R, see p. 151, e; p. 175 (7:2).

(15) עֵצָם selfsame, see p. 174 (7:13).

(16) יָלַד (Hiphil), see p. 163, (13).

NEW WORDS.

- (1) נָפֵשׁ.
- (2) אָרֶץ כְּנָעַן see above under 12:4b,5.
- (3) עָרֵי הַכֶּכֶר see above under 13:6,11b,12a.
- (4) אֵל שָׂדֵי not peculiar to P; in Gen. 48:14 E (Well.), or these words cut out of the verse and arbitrarily referred to R (Dill., Kautsch), שָׂדֵי Gen. 49:25; Num. 24:4,16 in J.

(5) אֶחָדָה not peculiar to P; repeatedly in Lev. 25 (not P, Well.); Num. 32:5,22 (J, Schröd., Kays.; JE, Well.; v. 5 J, Dill.); Josh. 21:12 (not P, Dill.), 22:4 (J, Schröd., Kays.: D, Well., Dill.). Dillmann accounts for the presence of this word in Josh. 22:4 by the magisterial assertion "אֶחָדָה אֶרֶץ a phrase of A(P) has been substituted by Rd or some later hand for אֶרֶץ אֲרִשְׁתֶּכֶם."

(6) מוֹל (מָלַל) occurs not only in P, but in D, Deut. 10:16; 30:6, and E, Josh. 5:2,3,8; and according to Wellhausen in J likewise, Gen. 34:15,17,22,24; a noun from this root also in J, Ex. 4:26.

(7) יִצְחָק... מְלָכִים occurs in but one other passage, 35:11, where the promise here made to Abraham is repeated to Isaac.

(8) יָלִיד nowhere in P except Gen. 17:14:14 is not P, nor is Lev. 22:11 according to Wellhausen; יָלִיד occurs besides in three places in the Hex. without בֵּית, all of them in J, Num. 13:22,28; Josh. 15:14.

(9) מִקְנֵת כֶּכֶף but once outside of Gen. 17, viz., in Ex. 12:44. מִקְנֵה occurs in Lev. 25:16, 51, which is not P, according to Wellhausen.

(10) בֵּן נָכַר but twice in Hex. outside of Gen. 17, viz., Ex. 12:43, P; Lev. 22:25 not P (Well.); elsewhere in Hex. only in J, Deut. 31:16; 32:12 or E, Gen. 35:24; Josh. 24:20,23.

(11) וְנִכְרְתָה הַנֶּפֶשׁ וְנָו a technical legal phrase, not to be expected except in legal sections.

(12) עָרַל but four times in P, Gen. 17:14; Ex. 6:12,30; 12:48; also in Lev. 19:23; 26:41 J (Dill.), not P (Well.); Josh. 5:7 Rd in E context.

(13) בָּשָׂר עָרְלָה but once outside of Gen. 17, viz., Lev. 12:3; עָרְלָה but once beside in P, twice in J, Ex. 4:25; Lev. 19:23, also in E, Josh. 5:3, and D, Deut. 10:16.

(14) בְּרִיתִי הָפַר but once in P, Gen. 17:14; besides in Hex. only in J, Lev. 26:15,44; Deut. 31:16,20.

2) LANGUAGE OF J.

OLD WORDS.

(1) יְהוָה already explained.

(2) מִזְבֵּחַ explained, p. 182, 2.

(3) מִקְרָם also in P, Num. 34:11, as stated, p. 176.

(4) אָהַל occurs in P, Ex. 16:16; Num. 19:14, 18, besides the multitude of instances in which it is applied to the sacred tent. The verb אָהַל 13:12,18, J occurs nowhere else in the Hex. and but once besides in the entire Bible, Isa. 13:20.

(5) נָא in P, Gen. 34:8, also Num. 20:10, according to Nöldeke and Schrader, and perhaps Dillmann who says v. 10a is from P, 10b mainly from E, though with same words from P.

(6) בַּעֲבוּר is always referred to J, E or R.

(7) מִקְנָה occurs several times in P, Gen. 34:23; 36:6,7; 46:6; Josh. 14:4, and according to a number of critics, Num. 31:9; 32:1,4,16,26; not to speak of Gen. 49:32, where it has a somewhat different sense.

(8) אֲנָכִי in P, Gen. 23:4.

(9) דָּוָן is not used by J; 15:14 (the passage adduced) is by the critics referred to R; besides in Hex. only Gen. 6:3, J; 30:6 to E; 49:16; Deut. 32:36 poetic passages alleged to be older than J and simply inserted by him.

(10) שָׁמַע לְקוֹל explained, p. 154 (38).

(11) וְתָהָר see p. 155 (35).

(12) עַל-כֵּן in P, Ex. 20:11; Lev. 17:12; Num. 18:24.

(13) כָּרַת בְּרִית see p. 174 under 6:18 (1).

(14) קָלַל in P, according to Dillmann, Lev. 24:11,14,15,23.

NEW WORDS.

(1) יִיעָתֵק מִשָּׁם Gen. 12:8; 26:22 J; עָתָק nowhere else in Hex.

(2) הִקְרִיב intrans., Gen. 12:11; Ex. 14:10 J; nowhere else intrans. in the entire Bible; elsewhere used transitively in J, Josh. 7:16-18; 8:23, and the Kal intrans., Gen. 27:41; 37:18; 47:29 just as in P.

(3) בָּגַל but three times in J, Gen. 12:13; 30:27; 39:5; besides in Hex. only in Deut.

(4) צוּה עַל the construction in Gen. 12:20 occurs nowhere else in J, and only once besides in the whole Bible, 2 Sam. 14:8.

(5) בַּתְּחִלָּה see p. 151, note.

(6) אֶלְנִי כִמְרָא Gen. 13:18, and but once besides in J 18:1; 14:13 is not his. Knobel refers 13:18a to P, since otherwise 23:2,17; 25:9 find their only explanation in J. אֶלְנִי כִמְרָא also in P, 23:17,19; 25:9; 35:27; 49:30; 50:13.

(7) נִשָּׂא עֵינָיִם in J, E, D, but not in P.

(8) לִקְרֹאת in the judgment of Nöldeke, Knobel and Schrader occurs in P Num. 31:13, where also by Dillmann's confession it stands directly between two "genuine phrases" of P.

(9) אָוִלִי in P Josh. 22:24 according to Wellhausen and Hollenberg.

(10) רָחֵיט is by the common consent of critics referred to J, 19:17,26. Dillmann refers every other passage in which it is found to E, except Gen. 15:5; and it too is E's according to Wellhausen and Kautzsch.

POETIC WORDS.

Why these words are called poetic is not very obvious, since most of them, which occur elsewhere, are found in plain prose. (1) יָכִין and שָׁמַאל as verbs, (8) פָּרָא, (9) רָאִי each occur once and once only in J. But it is not clear that the rest of the words adduced are to be found in J at all; (2) עֲרִירִי, כִּשֶּׁק, (3) צִדְקָה are not according to Wellhausen, nor (4) גִּזְלוֹ, (5) בָּתָר, (6) עֵיט, (7) עֲלֻטָּה, לִפְדִּי, גִּזְרִים according to Dillmann.

It is evident that a single or even occasional occurrence of a given word in passages attributed to a particular writer, does not prove it to be characteristic of his style. Much less can it be used to discriminate between him and another, in whose writings it is also found. Words that occur but rarely have no significance, and should be stricken from the critical lists. So should P words which occur likewise in J sections, or J words which are also found in P sections. And there is no significance in the fact that certain words occur in one class of sections, which do not occur in the other, unless it can be shown that there was occasion for their employment. Nor does the fact that a given word has been used by a certain writer in a particular instance of itself create a presumption that every other passage in which it is found is to be attributed to the same writer. And yet it is upon these fallacies, which are sufficiently refuted by the bare statement of them, that the whole critical scheme is constructed.

3) STYLE AND THEOLOGY OF P AND J.

1. It is said, p. 244, that P is "systematic" because he advances regularly by successive steps to a definite result, while, p. 247, J has "no particular system." In actual fact the "system" is as marked in the one case as in the other, as the most cursory examination is sufficient to show.

The call of Abraham opens the third period of the world's history, for which the way was prepared, and the necessity demonstrated (if God's plan of grace was not to be suffered to fail) by the disastrous issue of both the preceding periods. Mankind descending from Adam became hopelessly corrupt, and was swept away by the deluge, from which righteous Noah was spared to be the head of a new race. Impiety prevailed again after the flood, and mankind were scattered over the face of the earth. But God's purpose of mercy was not abandoned. He selected Abraham to be the head of a chosen nation within which true religion might be perpetuated for the ultimate benefit of the world. We are thus brought to the base on which the entire body of Old Testament institutions reposes.

The antecedent history moves on toward this divine scheme of restriction in order to a safe and final diffusion in various distinct though related lines. Thus the successive stages of iniquity depicted converge upon this issue. The fall of

our first parents, the crime of Cain, the ungodliness of his descendants reaching its acme in Lamech, the degeneracy of the pious race of Seth induced by intermarriage with the race of Cain, the sons of God with the daughters of men, thus pointing a lesson of which Genesis and the Pentateuch are full, viz., the criminality and the peril of the chosen seed allying themselves with the ungodly around them, the need and the duty of separation and of keeping themselves distinct. And after the world had been purged by the flood the impious and arrogant combination at Babel, frustrated by immediate divine interference, revealed the continuance of the old leaven, and pointed the argument for some new expedient to prevent the extinction of all goodness.

Add to this the gradual unfolding of the promise as set forth in each of these three great periods. The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head. Jehovah the God of Shem, in whose tents Japheth shall dwell. Abraham and his seed a blessing to all the families of the earth.

Also the regular dropping of side lines and following the main line so as to converge upon Abraham, thus indicating the distinctness of the chosen seed and at the same time their relationship to the whole body of mankind. Thus the line of descent from Cain is traced and then laid aside in order to pursue that of Seth, which the critics tell us J must have continued down to Noah, though only fragments remain, 4:25,26; 5:29. Then the sons of Noah are traced and dropped in J's portion of ch. 10, only that of Shem continued in the direction of Terah. Then in Terah's family Lot's descendants are named, 19:37,38, and Nahor's, 22:20 sqq., so in like manner the child of Hagar, and the children of Keturah and the twin brother of Jacob: these are successively set aside and Abraham, Isaac and Jacob left in sole possession of the promise.

We are further told, p. 247, "While the covenant between Yahweh and Abram is recorded, it is neither the climax nor the all-important fact of the narrative. It is connected with no institution; and the promise made then is only one of many repeatedly made by Yahweh in his familiar intercourse with the patriarchs."

The close concatenation of this history is here strangely overlooked. The promises to the patriarchs are not idle repetitions of the same identical substance. They rise by regular gradations in respect to both the matters to which they relate, the promised land and the promised seed. Jehovah first, 12:1, bade Abram go to a land that he would show him. After he reached Canaan it was made specific, v. 7, "Unto thy seed will I give *this* land." After Lot had parted from him, the terms are made universal, 13:14,15. *All* the land that thou seest, north, south, east and west, to thee will I give it and to thy seed *forever*. Then in Jehovah's covenant with Abram, ch. 15, this promise reaches its climax. Its certainty is confirmed by the divine pledge symbolically given. The time of the gift is defined, vs. 13-16, and the limits of the territory are particularly specified, vs. 18-

21. The promise has become a formal engagement of the utmost solemnity: what was at first vague and indefinite has attained to the utmost precision both as to the extent of the grant and the time of its bestowment.

Nevertheless it is true that the covenant transaction in ch. 15 is not in every point of view the climax. It rather marks an important stage in an advancing series. Jehovah *spoke* to Abram before he left his father's house, 12:1, as he had done to Noah, 7:1, to Adam, 3:17, and to Cain, 4:6. But when Abram entered Canaan, an advance was made upon all antecedent revelations. Jehovah *appeared* to him, 12:7. A step was taken beyond this in ch. 15, when Jehovah ratified a covenant with Abram by a visible token of his presence. Then, when Abram, ch. 17, obedient to divine direction ratified the covenant on his part by the seal of circumcision, the climax was reached, ch. 18, in the unequalled condescension of a manifestation unique in the whole Old Testament. Jehovah in human form partakes of a covenant meal as Abraham's guest, acquaints him with the divine counsels and admits him to the greatest intimacy. And so far from this being "connected with no institution," it is the basis of the whole future constitution of Israel as the people of God, 18:19, the foundation of its national counterpart enacted at Sinai.

The successive trials of Abraham's faith again form a graduated series, culminating in the sacrifice of Isaac.

And the promises to Abraham respecting his offspring exhibit a corresponding parallel. The Lord first engaged, 12:2, to make of him a great nation, and, 13:6, to make his seed as the dust of the earth. After years of vain expectation Abraham begins to suspect that he shall have no offspring of his own, but that an inmate of his house shall be his heir: whereupon the Lord assures him that he shall have a child of his own body, 15:3,4. But Sarah was barren; so at her instance he forms an intimacy with Hagar, and hopes that Ishmael may prove to be the expected seed. He is then informed that the child of the bondwoman is not the promised heir, but that Sarah his wife shall have a son. After Isaac is born he is tried once more by being bidden to offer him up as a sacrifice; and when his faith endured this final test, the promise of a numerous and victorious seed that shall bless the world was renewed in ampler terms than before and is confirmed by the new sanction of an oath, 22:15-18.*

With all this evidence of a developing plan and of methodical arrangement it surely cannot be said that J has "no particular system."

2. P is said, p. 245, to be "chronological and statistical" since he mentions dates and ages. The simple reason for this is that whenever a date occurs, even

* This is an embarrassing chapter for the critics as we shall see. The great majority have assumed that an account by J and another by E are here blended. The present tendency is with Dillmann to substitute for J free additions by R; in which case an independent production by a different writer fits as admirably into J's scheme, as though it had been prepared with special reference to it.

though in a J or E connection, it is for that reason alone referred to P, e. g., 12:4b; 16:16, and particularly glaring instances, 37:2; 41:46. Consequently as a matter of course P has all the dates and J has none, but it is the critical process which has brought it about.

3. P is said to be "generic" because he speaks, 12:5, of Abram as arriving "in the land of Canaan," and, 13:12, dwelling "in the land of Canaan," while J, 12:6 sqq.; 13:18, specifies Shechem, the oaks of Mamre, and other localities, and is hence said, p. 248, to be "individual" and to "abound in historical and geographical references." But this is due to critical dissection. Verses and clauses are arbitrarily sundered from a continuous narrative, with the rest of which they are set in contrast as though indicating diverse styles, when each is appropriate in its place. It is proper that when Abram came from Haran, his arrival in the land of Canaan should be first mentioned, 12:5, before the writer proceeds to specify the particular localities through which he passed. And when Lot parted from Abram, the significance of the event and the reason why it was recorded is brought out by the statement, 13:12, that it left Abram in possession of "the land of Canaan," thus preparing the way for the enlarged promise that follows, vs. 14-17, which are therefore most intimately connected, though the critics assign the former to P and the latter to J. When the occasion calls for it P is equally minute in specifying localities, 23:2,19; 35:6,27; 47:11, not to speak of the detailed boundaries of the land and of the tribes in Num. 34 and Josh. 15-19.

Under this same head stress is laid, p. 245, upon the fact that P simply says of the wealth of Abram and Lot, 13:6, "their substance was great," while J speaks more specifically, 13:2,5, of "cattle, silver and gold," "sheep, oxen and tents." Perhaps P is specific enough for even this standard, 23:17; 36:6; Ex. 7:19. Moreover one can hardly avoid asking whether critics do not sometimes have short memories. It is stated to be a mark of J, p. 46, 3, b, that he "summarizes what is unimportant," saying, 7:1, "thou and all thy house," while P has, 6:18, "thou and thy sons and thy wife and thy sons' wives;" and, p. 45, 2, j, P is characterized as "minute and scientific," because he says, 7:21, "fowl and cattle and beast and creeping thing and man," while J speaks in general terms of "every living substance," 7:23.

4. P is said to be "rigid and stereotyped" because of the recurrence of the same unvarying phrases. The repetition charged is largely for the sake of emphasis. And it is characteristic of Hebrew writers generally that they take little pains to vary their expressions. If the same thought is to be conveyed, it is mostly done, in the same or like terms. It is not difficult to produce an equal number of identical phrases in J. Thus, "lift up the eyes," 13:10,14; "unto thy seed will I give this land," 12:7; 15:18; "there he builded an altar unto Jehovah," 12:7,8; 13:18; "he called on the name of Jehovah," 12:8; 13:4; "the Canaanite

then in the land," 12:6; 13:7; "between me and thee," 13:8; 16:5. And if P expresses the promise of multitudes by $\square\text{'}\text{}$ without a rhetorical figure, so does J, 12:2; 18:18.

5. P is said to be "verbose and repetitious." But the repetitions adduced are all for the sake of emphasizing what was of great consequence in the view of the writer. So "the land of Canaan," 12:5b, as Abram's objective point and to mark the contrast with a former unfulfilled project, 11:31; Ishmael born of the bond-maid, not the wife, 16:3,15; and particularly in ch. 17. Like repetitions can be pointed out in J, e. g., "Jehovah who appeared unto him," 12:7; "Bethel on the west," v. 8, repeats what had just been said; "famine in the land," v. 10; the last clause of v. 13 adds nothing; 13:3b,4a repeat 12:8 with needless minuteness; "to thee will I give it," 13:15,17; "and the angel of Jehovah said," 16:9,10,11.

6. "The etymologies furnished" are adduced, p. 37, 9, as characterizing J in distinction from P; but P has the like, 17:5,15 (cf. 16), 19 (cf. 17), 20.

7. It is said, p. 248, J is "anthropomorphic." This has already been discussed, p. 182 sqq. "Yahweh appears often and familiarly." Jehovah is said to have *appeared* to Abram but three times in the whole course of his life, twice in J, 12:7; 18:1; once in P, 17:1, where the critics say that the text should be Elohim. Jehovah *spake* repeatedly to Abram, and on one occasion to Hagar, 16:13; so did God in P to Abram, ch. 17; to Noah, 6:13; 8:15, and to the first human pair, 1:28. "Pharaoh's plagues came *directly* from Yahweh." So Elohim healed Abimelech, 20:17, a passage which, like most of those in which Elohim occurs, is arbitrarily assigned to another than P; but accepting the division made by the critics Elohim in P *directly* took Enoch, 5:24, overthrew the cities of the plain, rescued Lot, 19:29, and blessed Isaac, 25:11. The manifestation of Jehovah's presence in smoke and flame, 15:17 J, has a precise parallel in P in the cloud and fire above the tabernacle which guided Israel through the desert, Ex. 40:36-38, Num. 9:15 sqq. Why Jehovah announced himself, 17:1 P, as God Almighty, p. 249, 1, has been already explained: God Almighty also occurs in J (or E), 43:14, and the Almighty, 49:25. "Abram falls on his face" before Elohim; so in J he "prostrates himself to the earth" before Jehovah, 18:2, and acknowledges himself to be "dust and ashes," 18:27. "God is present but not *visible*" in covenanting with Abram in P, which is contradicted in express terms, 17:1, cf. v. 22; Ex. 6:3.

8. "P persistently and consistently mentions neither altar nor offering, even at the making of a covenant, while J tells of many altars built and specifies the victims slaughtered for the covenant." According to the strict letter of the record J mentions altars built by the patriarchs, but never once a sacrifice offered by them. The only sacrifices explicitly mentioned in the patriarchal age are in an Elohim connection, 22:2,13; 46:1, which are arbitrarily referred by the critics to another than P. Nevertheless P speaks of a drink offering, 35:14. See further pp. 184, 185.

9. As to J's not speaking of "circumcision as an institution," p. 250, its divine obligation is obvious from Ex. 4:26 J, where this is the whole point of the narrative. It is not very clear on what ground it is affirmed, p. 244, 2 (6), that in Josh. 5 "it is related as a *custom*, not as a *law*." The rite is performed at the express command of Jehovah, who directs the renewal of the long neglected ordinance. It immediately precedes the observance of the passover in evident compliance with Ex. 12:48. The demand that J or E should contain the law of circumcision is quite unreasonable, both because there was no occasion to repeat what had already been given, and all ritual law simply as such is referred to P.

6. No Inconsistencies.

1) Hupfeld (*Quellen*, p. 20) alleges that according to P, 12:4b,5, Abram simply continues the migration to Canaan begun by his father, 11:31, acting from the same impulse and from natural motives and receiving no divine call till he had been twenty-four years in Canaan, ch. 17. Whereas J, 12:1, represents his journey as undertaken at the divine command, Abram not knowing whither. This simply shows how easy it is to produce the semblance of contrariety by sundering a narrative, and setting its parts in opposition instead of suffering them to supplement one another. The movement initiated by Terah to find more desirable quarters was carried out by Abram at Jehovah's bidding, who guided him to the land to which his father had originally intended to go.

2) He finds a further discrepancy in the fact that 12:1 J, if interpreted by v. 4, P, must mean that Abram was called while in Haran, whereas J's idea, as appears from 15:7, is that he received his call in Ur of the Chaldees. Dillmann corrects this by showing from 24:4, that in J's view Abram's ארץ ומולדת was Haran; though his conclusions that J knew nothing of Ur of the Chaldees and that 15:7 was an insertion by R are alike unfounded. That there is no express mention of Nahor's migration from Ur, while Haran is called the city of Nahor 24:10, cf. 29:4,5, is of no account; for the writer is tracing Abram's history not Nahor's. And the statement of 15:7 is in full accord with the entire narrative. Jehovah providentially led Abram to accompany Terah to Haran, and then by an immediate call brought him to Canaan.

3) There is no conflict in the chronology between 12:4 and 11:32. Abram left Haran many years before Terah's death. Only the writer according to his uniform method completes Terah's life before proceeding to that of Abram, cf. 25:7; 35:29. Acts 7:4 follows the order of the narrative, not that of time.

4) Wellhausen claims that 12:10-20 is a later addition to the text, and Dillmann that it is transposed from its original position after 13:18, p. 245, note, because Lot was not with Abram in Egypt, though according to J, he was with him before 12:4a, and after 13:5; and Abram was at the very same place in 13:4 as in 12:18. But the visit to Egypt is confirmed by 26:1,2, the presence of Lot

there by the express statement "Lot with him" 13:1, and his retracing his steps to the point from which he had started, vs. 3,4. These explicit confirmations are by a stroke of the critics' pen ejected from the text and attributed to R for no imaginable reason, but that they nullify a baseless critical conjecture. Lot's name does not occur in 12:10-20 for the very same reason that is not found in 6-9, viz., because Abram was the principal party and there was nothing to record respecting Lot. It may be remarked further that 16:1 lends an incidental confirmation to 12:16. But we are told, p. 249, that this is "inconsistent with P's dates." "Sarai was over sixty-five years old; that a woman at such an age, however attractive, could so charm the Egyptian court, as to endanger her husband's life, is inconceivable." The question at present, however, is not whether this was an actual fact or was even possible. But was it impossible in the view of the writer of the narrative? If not, he may have written it as we here find it. On the hypothesis of the critics, R believed it and recorded it. Now will they please to tell us how they know that J could not have believed what it seems that R did, respecting the marvellous beauty of the ancestress of the nation. As to the truth of the story we may leave the critics to settle that with J.

5) P. 249. In P "Abram and Lot separate for lack of room simply "while in J it is because of the strife of their herdmen. So in regard to Sarai and Hagar, Jacob and Esau, "P does not know of any family quarrels," but J is "interested in the domestic differences of the patriarchs." This is merely objecting that the part is not equal to the whole. The story is arbitrarily split in two. The lack of room which leads to the strife is given to P; the strife which results from the lack of room to J. Each part implies the other and is incomplete without it.

6) The thoroughly arbitrary manner, in which the critics deal with the text, is illustrated by Wellhausen and Kuenen throwing out 13:14-17 as an insertion by Rd, p. 245. The former says, (*Composition d. Hex.*, p. 23) "Grounds of a general nature, which will convince few, move me to regard 13:14-17 as a later addition. It is not the habit of J to let God speak so without ceremony to the patriarchs; he is always particular to narrate a theophany in a place precisely indicated, which is then hallowed by this appearing for all time." That is it precisely. Set up an arbitrary standard for a writer. Whatever does not conform to that standard is not genuine. And your point is proved.

7) Chapter 15 is declared to be incoherent. In v. 5 it is night, yet v. 12 the sun is just going down, v. 17 it is after sunset. In v. 6 Abram's faith is affirmed and approved; yet, v. 8, he asks some visible token of the truth of God's word, which is granted to him. Nevertheless the most cursory inspection of the chapter shows that it is consistent throughout and develops regularly from first to last. The preparation of the animals, vs. 9, 10, for the solemnity that was to follow, and guarding them from the birds of prey, v. 11, filled the interval between the revelation before the dawn of day, v. 4, and the approach of sunset, v. 12. And that a

man of strong faith, tried as Abram was, might have occasion to ask for some confirmation of his faith, is no mystery to those, who have repeated the tearful cry, "Lord, I believe; help thou mine unbelief."

On the grounds above stated Wellhausen assigns vs. 1-6 to E, vs. 7-18 to J, v. 7 having been modified and vs. 13-16 transposed from their proper position after v. 18, by R; vs. 19-21 are a later addition. Dillmann assigns vs. 1,2,4,8,9-11,17,18 to E, vs. 3,5,6 to J, vs. 7,12-16 to R, vs. 19-21 may be either E or R. For a fuller conspectus of the critical confusion which reigns in this chapter, see p. 245, where the varying divisions of Kautzsch, Kuenen, Budde, Delitzsch, and Kittell are succinctly stated. The revelation by vision, v. 1, is on critical principles referred to E, and this is supposed to be confirmed by the naming of Eliezer, v. 2, whereas J does not give his name, 24:2sq. (the identity of the persons being commonly assumed), also by the phrase "after these things," v. 1, in E, 22:1; 40:1(?); 48:1, but also in J, 22:20; 39:7, and even in P, Josh. 24:27, unless it is confessed that P is not alone in stating ages. The only escape from this dilemma is by the absurd division of Schrader, who assigns "and it came to pass after these things" to E, and the rest of the verse to P. Yet Jehovah is repeated six times in the first eight verses, though by critical rules E ought always to say Elohim never Jehovah. It is necessary, therefore, to assume that R has changed these names. There are also some of P's expressions **אני**, **אור כשרים**, v. 7, **רכש** v. 14, **בשיבה טובה** v. 15, (see 25:8), not to speak of the chronological statement, v. 13. The verses, that contain them, must accordingly have been either altered or inserted by R, whose office is to rectify whatever is at variance with the hypothesis. "Come forth out of thy bowels" **מעים** v. 4, sounds like a variation upon "Come forth out of thy loins," a phrase which P uses in two forms, 35-11 **חלצים**; 46:26; Ex. 1:5 **ירך**, and might easily be supposed to add a third. The animals, v. 9, are precisely those admissible for sacrifice under the ritual law, (P), and not dividing the birds accords with Lev. 1:17. "The word of Jehovah came," vs. 1,4 is a phrase familiar in the prophets, but occurring nowhere else in the Pentateuch, a circumstance upon which great stress would be laid, if there was any end to be answered by it. The inhabitants of the land are called Amorites, v. 16, while J calls them Canaanites and Perizzites, 12:6; 13:7; but if R designated them as in v. 16, how could he have written vs. 19-21?

Dillmann, as shown above, joined v. 8 directly with v. 4, and observes that it connects well if we only assume, what there is not the slightest reason for doing, that **אירשנה** "I shall inherit it" was originally **יירשני** "he shall be my heir." But his own comment on v. 18 overturns his conjecture and with it his critical division of the chapter. Verse 18 remarks expressly that by the transaction from v. 9 onward, God concluded a covenant with Abram in relation to the future possession of the land. Then the sign asked in v. 8 was not to cer-

tify that Abram's own child should be his heir, and v. 8 cannot connect with v. 4, but relates to a different subject.

And Wellhausen's division is no better. According to Ex. 32:13, J, God promised Abraham to multiply his seed as the stars of heaven. This emblem occurs three times in Genesis, 15:5; 22:17; 26:4. By common critical consent the last two are by R, long posterior to J. Consequently from the critics' point of view he must have referred to 15:5, which Wellhausen attributes to E, an entirely independent document.

When Dillmann gives 15:18 to E, notwithstanding the reference to it in 24:7, J, this is not inconsistent with his scheme, for he supposes J to have had E before him and even to have borrowed passages from it, which Wellhausen does not allow.

Dillmann alleges that ch. 16 contains no express allusion to ch. 15. And yet one would think that the allusion is obvious enough. Chapter 16 is an effort to obtain what was promised in ch. 15, a child of Abram's own, no mention being made of Sarai.

8) In ch. 16, Wellhausen followed by Kautzsch regards vs. 8-10 and Kuenen and Kittell vs. 9,10 as an insertion by R. The one proof that these verses should be ejected is that thus a conflict can be created with P 17:23sq., and E, 21:9, and it can be made to appear as though Ishmael was born in the desert and not in Abraham's house. If only the angel's direction to Hagar to return to her mistress could be an interpolation intended to harmonize discrepant accounts, this would be accomplished. And a critics' wish is equivalent to a fiat.

7. Chapter 14.

Astruc set the example of referring ch. 14 to another source than the principal documents of Genesis, as he did every passage which concerned foreign tribes or nations. The critics complain that it is disconnected and out of harmony with what precedes and follows in its representation of Abram but without good reason. The greatness of Abram's retinue is remarked, 12:5,16; 13:6,7. The children of Heth treat him as a mighty prince or a prince of God, 23:6. The king of the Philistines and the general of his army court his alliance, 21:22sq. That he could muster 318 trained men, cf. 33:1, that he was confederate with native princes, that as the head of a clan in contrast with other tribes or nations he is called Abram the Hebrew, is quite natural. His generous regard for Lot his brother's son, 14:12 as 11:27, appears from 13:8sq.; 18:23. The land had been given him with new emphasis in all its length and breadth, 13,15,17; it is quite in place that he should act as its champion and defender. The exhortation and the military emblem, 15:1, seem to be suggested by his late conflict. Lot was dwelling in Sodom, 14:12 as 13:12, and Abram by the oaks of Mamre, 14:13 as 13:18; 18:1. Admah and Zeboiim are joined with Sodom and Gomorrah, 14:8 as

10:19, and Zoar as 19:23. Words of P, J and E are combined in this chapter, together with characteristics elsewhere ascribed to them severally, p. 251, in a manner to suggest that the same writer could use the diction and possess the peculiarities of all the documents, and which the critics can only account for on the supposition that it has all been "worked over by R." That, p. 251, no allusion is made to the wickedness of Sodom and Gomorrah is no more strange than in 10:19; cf. also 12:6; 13:7 with 15:16. The narrative gave no occasion to refer to it. 14:14 can only be discredited by 12:12 on the assumption that a brave man can never be inconsistent enough to show weakness. How was it with Elijah and Peter? In the interest of unity of authorship it is sufficient if the historian could think this possible, as the critics' R evidently did.

The antiquity of this narrative is indicated by the number of ancient names requiring explanation, vs. 3,7,8,17 ("vale of Siddim," identical with the "plain of Jordan," p. 251, 3, 3 (1), but with what was subsequently "the salt sea"), the primeval populations, vs. 5,6, and unusual expressions, p. 251, 3. 1. Its historical truth is vouched for by remarkable monumental evidence (see Schrader, *KAT*²), which no inventions of a late writer could have simulated; nor would it have been consonant with a late age to invent such a character as Melchizedek (cf. Josh. 10:1), whose God Abram identified with his own, vs. 19,22, cf. also 24:3, to whom he did homage by paying tithes, and who combined offices distinct in Jewish usage, nor to mention Sodom without reference to its sin and its doom. Why the mention of a priest (cf. Gen. 41:50; Ex. 2:16), p. 252, with which a blessing and tithes were naturally connected, should imply a late date is not obvious. The mention of Salem in this narrative doubtless gained a new and striking significance, after Jerusalem became the political and religious capital of the land; but this does not disprove the reality of the occurrence. If "Dan," v. 14, is a "gloss by a later hand," p. 252, d, which is quite supposable, it offers no objection to the Mosaic origin of the chapter.

[Continued in April number of *HEBRAICA*.]